

REMARKS:

Claim 1 is in the case and presented for consideration.

Claim 1 has been amended. Support for the amendments to claim 1 can be found throughout the originally filed specification, claims and drawings.

Claim 3 has been canceled and its former subject matter added to currently amended claim 1.

SPECIFICATION

The specification has been amended to add further clarity to the description of the invention. The amendments to the specification serve to expressly state meanings, definitions and information on the various steps of the presently claimed method that are inherent in light of the context in which they are used in the disclosure, and/or are consistent with the plain and ordinary meaning of the relevant terms which were present in the originally filed application. Thus, support for the amendments to the specification can be found throughout the originally filed specification, claims and drawings.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

Both the specification as well as currently amended claim 1 have been amended in accordance with Examiner's comments. Thus the claims are now believed to comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

FIRST REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over International Publication Number WO 01/54346 to Miettinen ("Miettinen") in view of et al.

U.S. Patent 6,996,543 to Coppersmith ("Coppersmith"). Also, claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miettinen in view of Coppersmith and further in view of U.S. Patent Application 2005/0257055 filed by Anderson ("Anderson").

Applicant respectfully traverses the Office's rejection that claim 1 of the present application is obvious in view of the cited prior art.

Miettinen, Coppersmith and Anderson all fail to disclose or suggest critical elements of currently amended claim 1.

None of the above cited prior art references discloses an electronic certificate comprising a "character image which can be selected from among several shapes" as is claimed in currently amended claim 1.

Thus, because none of the cited references discloses a electronic certificate which comprises a "character image" as claimed in the present invention, that is a visually distinctive shape, it logically follows that the cited prior art references also do not disclose a electronic certificate which itself is capable of authenticating genuineness of goods. As evidenced by the certificate in Fig. 3 of Miettinen, in order for someone to authenticate genuineness of goods when using the system disclosed in Miettinen, they would have to confirm a match of information in all the listed categories.

Additionally, Miettinen Coppersmith and Anderson all fail to disclose a method for servicing an electronic certificate, wherein the same electronic certificate can be transferred from client of a transferor to the client of a transferee together with transfer of

the goods, hence achieving a change of ownership.

However, Applicant respectfully disagrees that claimed manner of changing ownership is obvious.

As Examiner correctly indicates, Anderson teaches that the ownership record can be **recreated**. (emphasis added). Inherent in a recreation of something is the prior destruction of its predecessor.

By contrast, when changing ownership in the claimed manner, i.e., by transferring **the same** electronic certificate from the client of a transferor to the client of a transferee, the record of ownership is not being destroyed and then **recreated**, but it is merely being moved. (emphasis added).

Another important difference between the teachings of Anderson and the claimed method is that the claimed manner of changing ownership involves one less step as compared with the initial destruction and subsequent recreation of the record laid out in Anderson. Accordingly, it logically follows that because it involves fewer steps, the claimed manner of changing ownership is simpler, takes less time and hence is likely to be more desirable. However, despite these facts, none of the cited prior art references even suggests such a method.

Thus, the superiority and greater desirability of the claimed manner of changing ownership coupled with its absence from the prior art, amounts to compelling evidence of its non-obviousness.

Moreover, none of the above cited prior art references provide a teaching or suggestion which would be sufficient to motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to come up with and combine the otherwise missing elements and hence arrive at the presently

claimed invention.

Therefore, because the aforementioned references fail to disclose critical elements claimed in currently amended independent claim 1, and because they do not provide a teaching which would motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the presently claimed invention, claim 1 is not obvious in light of any combination of Miettinen, Coppersmith and Anderson.

Accordingly, the application and claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, and favorable action is respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added.

If any issues remain, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the number below, to advance the application to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,
/SALVATORE P SPEZIO/
Salvatore P. Spezio
Reg. No. 60,868
Attorney for Applicant
(845) 359-7700

Dated: September 2, 2009

NOTARO & MICHALOS P.C.
100 Dutch Hill Road, Suite 110
Orangeburg, New York 10962-2100

Customer No. 21706

R:\PATAMD\J323-053\J323-053-Amend-Draft1.wpd